DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 005 CS 508 498

AUTHOR Doll, Howard D.
TITLE Graduate Degree Programs in Performance Studies.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Communication Research; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Oral Interpretation; Program Descriptions; Speech Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Performance Studies (Speech)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the national status of graduate degree programs in Performance Studies in 1990. Of the 37 institutions offering master's of doctoral degrees in oral interpretation who were sent surveys, 22 (59%) responded. Results indicated (1) the loss of graduate programs was problematic; (2) some scholars had difficulty with securing same-field colleagues, research, and administrative support; (3) minority recruitment needs to be improved; (4) peer and colleague support seemed to be a significant problem; (5) rather than a decimation of the field due to budget cuts, the field of performance studies has consolidated and refined itself--programs are geographically available in every part of the country; (6) the majority of programs report few problems with staffing, research, colleague and administrative support; and (7) two-thirds of the institutions surveyed required performance studies for undergraduate majors, and almost half require it for undergraduate majors. (Twelve tables of data and 21 notes are included.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 005

GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PERFORMANCE STUDIES

HOWARD D. DOLL

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. DOLL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS508498

Howard D. Doll

GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PERFORMANCE STUDIES

In 1972, Judith C. Espinola and Kenneth C. Crannell investigated the national status of graduate degree programs in interpretation.[1] This report was followed the next year by Malthon Anapol and H. Thomas Hurt's national survey of graduate study in Speech Communication for the years 1966-1971.[2] While the Anapol and Hurt study included oral interpretation/performance studies in its data as an area within the larger field of Speech Communication, no follow-up graduate survey in oral interpretation has been published since 1972.

Significant changes have occurred in interpretation over the past twenty years. For example, in 1980, the first issue of Literature in Performance, currently titled Text and Performance Quarterly, was published under the aegis of the Speech Communication Association; also the former Interpretation Division of SCA was renamed Performance Studies in 1992, a change necessitated by the enlarged scope of scholarship in the area:

> Oral Interpretation scholarship today grows increasingly diverse. The pursuit of research questions has led interpreters to perceive connections with other disciplines, particularly with those social sciences and humanities that share paradigms based on analogies drawn from cultural performance. Consequently, interpreters recently have been investigating, adopting, and synthesizing theory and practice from both inside and outside of the speech communication field. The process had broadened the perimeters of interpretation and, in some cases, has forged new definitions for the concepts and relationships involved in the triad of performer, text, and audience.[3]

CS508498

Membership in the national organization has varied considerably over the
2 past twenty years. In 1970, SCA membership reached 7,385, the highest total in SCA's history.[4] In 1981 membership hit its modern low of 4,625; however, by 1990, the numbers had risen steadily to 6,044. Membership in the Interpretation Division also varied considerably during these 20 years. In 1978, for example, Interpretation Division membership totalled 351, or 6% of SCA enrollment.[5] In 1985, although Interpretation Division membership had fallen to 333, it was 7% of SCA's total. In 1988 membership in the Interpretation Division increased to 475, or approximately 8% of total SCA membership.[6] Current Interpretation Division membership is assumed to be 8% of total SCA membership or approximately 480 people. Thus, as membership in SCA increases, so does membership in Performance Studies, consistently comprising approximately 8% of SCA membership.

Since no survey of graduate education in Performance Studies has been published since 1972, the purpose of this study was to investigate and report on the national status of graduate degree programs in Performance Studies in 1990.

PROCEDURE

To conduct the survey, a three-part questionnaire was developed. In Part I, respondents were asked to provide information regarding their institution, department, and graduate program. In Part II, respondents were queried regarding institutional and departmental characteristics and policies affecting the present and future status of Performance Studies. In Part III, respondents were asked to rank national M.A. and Ph.D. programs with respect to their quality.

In October, 1989, questionnaires and a cover letter were mailed to 37 institutions. Twenty-three of the institutions receiving questionnaires are listed in the SCA's 1986-1987 Directory of Graduate Programs as offering only M.A. degrees in Oral Interpretation.[7] Four institutions were

3 added to the list of M.A. programs based on the surveyors' personal knowledge of active scholars and programs. The remaining ten institutions are listed in the Directory as offering both the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Oral Interpretation and are hereafter referred to as Ph.D programs.[8]

In August, 1990, a second mailing was sent to those institutions not responding to the first request. Of the 37 institutions polled, 22 (59%) responded.

Espinola and Crannell, in creating their 1970 survey pool of graduate institutions, noted 79 schools listed in the 1969-1970 edition of SCA's Directory of Graduate Programs in Speech.[9] However, responses from these institutions indicated that only 32 (52%) of the 79 did in fact offer graduate degrees in Interpretation. Their final sample consisted of 17 M.A.-only and 15 Ph.D. graduate programs. Espinola and Crannell's final figures agree more closely with Anapol and Hurt's figures of 22 M.A. and 15 Ph.D. programs.[10] The figures of the two 1970 surveys suggest that graduate programs in Performance Studies has been stable over the past 20 years.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I. INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Institutional scholars responding to the survey were 88% tenured. Sixty percent were full, 24% associate, and 12% assistant professors; 4% had other faculty status. All held doctorate degrees. Each had held her or his position from 4 to 33 years; those with 5 to 10 years experience represented 28% of the sample as did those with more than 20 years experience (0-5 years = 8%; 11-15 years = 20%; 16-20 years = 16%). Eighty- eight percent had directed theses while 28% had directed dissertations.

4 In 1972, Espinola and Crannell reported that the largest number of graduate programs in Performance Studies were in the southern part of the United States. In 1990, the majority of M.A. programs (55%, n = 12) were in the northern part of the country, as were the majority of Ph.D. programs. A more discrete breakdown of locations shows both M.A. an Ph.D. programs concentrated in the Northcentral region (see Table 1).

II. INSTITUTIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Table 2 describes institutional enrollment. Undergraduate enrollment varied from less than 5,000 to more than 40,000 students. Institutional graduate enrollment was nearly evenly distributed in the four size categories. In the pool of institutions surveyed, 86% (n = 19) of those responding offered the Ph.D. in their institution (i.e., they were in Ph.D.-granting institutions), while 46% (n = 10) of the respondents offered the Ph.D. in their department.

DEPARTMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS

The departments represented a variety of names: Speech Communication(s) (10); Communication(s) or Communication Studies (6); Theatre (2); Speech (1); Performance Studies (1); Communication and Theatre Arts (1); and Interpersonal Communication (1). In 1973, Anapol and Hurt noted a significant trend in department title change: "Speech or speech and drama accounted for 90% of the department designations in 1966; presently [1971] they account for less than half, while communication and speech communication have grown from less than 2% to 23% of the total number of departments reporting."[11]

They also offered a variety of areas of concentration. The Directory of Graduate Programs lists 13 areas of concentration for graduate programs. Departmental offerings in these areas are listed in Table 3.

In M.A.-only programs, a thesis is required in 25%, it is optional in 42% and it "varies with program" in 33%. In doctoral programs, in addition to a dissertation, one foreign language is required by 10%; methodology or research tool coursework is required by 60%; the remaining programs do not list specific requirements. In 1973, Anapol and Hurt noted that "Whereas 95% of the [doctoral] programs required two languages in 1966, that requirement survives in just 15% of the [1971] programs. One result is a trend toward one language."[13] Their prediction of one language for the Ph.D. seems to have been prescient.

UNDERGRADUATE SPEECH COMMUNICATION MAJORS

Undergraduate majors in all areas of communication at the respondents' schools varied from 43 to over 1,200 in those programs offering the Ph.D., 40 to 600 for those offering only the M.A. On the whole, the Ph.D.-granting institutions tended to have more undergraduate majors, with 50% of them serving 400 or more; M.A.-only institutes served 300 or more majors 50% of the time. With both institutions in consideration, undergraduate enrollment patterns were as shown in Table 4.

In 68% of the institutions, Performance Studies is required for the undergraduate major, while 45% require Performance Studies for a minor. In addition, 59% of the institutions have a university-wide requirement in which Performance Studies is an elective course. Thirty six percent have other departments on campus that require Performance Studies. The undergraduate enrollment pattern in Performance Studies courses was seen by respondents as increasing in 41% (n = 9) of the schools, decreasing in 23% (n = 5), remaining stable in 18% (n = 4), and fluctuating in 13% (n = 3).

"Mass lecture" courses in Performance Studies are taught at 41% (n = 9) of the institutions. These large classes range in size from 100 to 540

classes, a fairly recent innovation designed to increase efficiency in undergraduate teaching, allow greater numbers of undergraduate students to be taught while efficiently utilizing professor's time. At the same time, they provide graduate teaching assistants opportunities for teaching with professorial monitoring.

Undergraduate student enrollment for Performance Studies was encouraging in both M.A.-only and Ph.D. programs. While 50% of both programs reported no Performance Studies undergraduate students, the M.A.-only programs reported an average of 9 undergraduates (ns =1, 4, 8, 15, 15, and 30). The Ph.D programs reported an average of 30 students (ns = 9, 15, 25, 48 and 55).

DEPARTMENTAL GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Departmental graduate student enrollment in all areas varied from 0-250 (M.A. = 0-105; Ph.D. = 0-250). Thirteen percent of those responding reported no current graduate students enrolled; 32% reported 27-30 students; 18% reported 31-45 students; 14% reported 46-60 students; 9% reported 61-70 students; and 14% reported more than 70 graduate students in their department.

Distribution figures for graduate students include the total number of graduate students (above), the number of male and female M.A. and doctoral students, and the number of male and female minority M.A. and Ph.D. students below (see Table 5).

PERFORMANCE STUDIES GRADUATE ENROLLMENT

Almost half (49.5%) of the schools reported no Performance Studies graduate students, while 41% reported from 1 to 7 students, and the remaining 9% report 16 and 28, respectively, for a total of 63 graduate students. Distribution figures for Performance Studies graduate students are presented in Table 6. Forty-five percent of the schools have a special track or emphasis in Performance Studies at the graduate level.

The completion rate for Performance Studies Ph.D. candidates varied. Ten percent of the respondents gave the completion percentage rate as

65%; 10% indicated 85%; and 30% estimated a 90% completion rate (50% = NR). The time frame for completion of the Performance Studies Ph.D. students varied from three to five years, with 10% predicting three years, 20% indicating three-and-a-half years, and 20% projecting five years (50% = NR). The number of Performance Studies Ph.D. students graduated in an "average" year varied from zero to three, with 10% of the respondents each indicating one, one-and-a-half, two-and-a-half, and three-per-year (60% = NR).

Graduate enrollment patterns for Performance Studies students since 1980 have increased in four schools (18%), decreased in four (18%), remained the same in six (27%), and fluctuated in two (10%), (27% = NR). Enrollment trend expectations for the 1990s were seen as increasing by 4 respondents (18%), decreasing by 2 (9%), and remaining about the same by 11 (50%), (23% = NR).

In view of the apparent national trend toward retrenchment, respondents were asked to explain the factors that contributed to their current enrollment pattern. Those who indicated that their departments had undergone an increase or stabilization in enrollment cited positive influences, such as: increased interest in Speech Communication as a major and the concomitant acceptance of Performance Studies as a humanities requirement in their colleges, departments, or ancillary areas; positive, proactive relationships with their administration; increased attention to enrolling freshmen students; and the growth of cultural diversity programs that foster interdepartmental and intercollegial exchange. Those whose departments had experienced decreased enrollments note the lack of vocational clarity, rumors of course difficulty, lack of specialization at the undergraduate level, a paucity of administrative support in the face of great demand for performance courses, and the lack of a second colleague in their own department who could offer more opportunities in Performance Studies.

STIPENDS

8 Graduate student TA stipends for MA and Ph.D. programs ranged from a low of $2,400 to a high of $13,000 (see Table 7).

A tuition waiver for out of state candidates is granted by 72% of the institutions, while 18% do not grant out of state tuition waivers (10% = NR). In addition, 72% of the departments offer opportunities for graduate students to earn other monies.

GRADUATE FACULTIES

The number and distribution of graduate faculty for M.A. and Ph.D. granting schools is summarized in Table 8. Minority faculty representation includes one minority male in the M.A. programs and four minority males in the Ph.D. programs for a .5% representation in the M.A. programs and a 2.3% representation in the Ph.D. programs. Minority female representation is similar in both programs, with a 1% representation in the M.A. programs and a 1.1% representation in the Ph.D. programs. The total number of minority faculty representatives for both programs was 10. Of these 10, two were Performance Studies faculty members, one with the M.A. and one with the Ph.D. programs.

In order to determine the need for Performance Studies scholars, respondents were asked to estimate the number of Performance Studies faculty projecting retirement. The data indicated that 7 faculty members expect to retire in 5 years or less, 6 project retirement in 6 to 10 years, and 15 estimate retirement in 11 or more years.

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Extra-curricular activities at surveyed institutions include faculty-directed performances (59%) at least once per year, student-directed performances (54%) at least once per year, faculty reading hour (45%) at least once per year, student reading hour (59%) at least once per year, and lectures/performances by visiting scholars (32% at least once every two years. Very few (9%) host festivals on a regular basis (once a school year), and few (14%) host festivals less than once every two years: however 54%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

attend festivals at least once a school year. More (32%) institutions host 9 tournaments than attend (23%) tournaments. Tournament attendance varies from 4 tournaments to as many as 20 tournaments per year.

ARTISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

When asked if their institution equated artistic achievement with other forms of scholarship, 23% responded no, and 72% indicated yes (5% = NR). Over half of those responding positively (59%) indicated that the recognition was in written form.

PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

Potential problems/challenges for Performance Studies faculty in the 1990s, were surveyed. Respondents were given eight areas of possible concern: Staffing, Research Support, Attracting Graduate Students, Placing Graduate Students, Rehearsal and Performance Space, Colleague Support, Administrative Support, and Equipment and Supplies. Four responses were offered: (1) No problem, (2) Slight Problem, (3) Significant Problem, and (4) Major Problem. Category (5) was Not Applicable/No Response. The responses are summarized in Table 9. Problem areas indicated by the results are Attracting Graduate Students, seen as a significant/major problem by 59% of the respondents, and Space Problems, seen as a significant/major problem by 45%. It is encouraging to note that difficulties are perceived as minor/slight in Staffing (68%), Research Support (68%), Graduate Student Placement (55%), Colleague Support (59%), Administrative Support (59%) and Equipment and Supplies (73%).

The final question in Part II asked scholars to describe the unique or outstanding aspects of their own program. Some of the responses were familiar, but they certainly bear repeating: "emphasis on individual attention"; "devoted, excellent, and nationally recognized faculty"; "excellence of instruction"; "emphasis on analysis and research"; "a strong sense of center--literature--that allows students to take advantage of . . . excellent programs in drama, folklore, literary criticism, oral traditions, and film without losing their sense of a discipline". "Performance in Society

curriculum and productions"; "state-of-the-art facilities"; "interdisciplinary
10 focus and exchange opportunities"; "the opportunity to study classical as well as modern literature"; "quantitative as well as literary and historical research"; and, finally, "a commitment to the intellectual/aesthetic development of the functionally impoverished student."

III. PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

Respondents were asked to rank the top 10 M.A. and the 10 Ph.D. institutions in terms of quality of program with 1 being the highest ranking. The results are presented in Table 10 and 11. The lowest average rating represents the highest perceived quality. Only those institutions receiving four or more votes were considered.

DISCUSSION

Results of the survey are both disheartening and encouraging. The loss of graduate programs is problematic. That there are scholars, even though they are in the minority, who have difficulty with securing same-field colleagues, research, administrative support, attracting and placing graduate students, finding space for performance and rehearsal, and obtaining equipment and supplies is surely frustrating and demoralizing. Another area of concern is the lack of minority representation in the graduate programs. Espinola and Crannell did not address this issue in 1972; consequently, we have no data against which to measure progress in minority recruitment and acceptance. Surely, progress has been made in this area in the past 20 years; however, there is room and need for significant improvement in minority recruitment.

Peer and colleague support also seems to be a significant problem; as long as there is only one Performance Studies scholar in a department, course offerings, research stimuli, and the development of a national reputation for scholarship will be constrained.

At the same time there are problems, there is much to praise. We
11 began by noting the effects of tightening budgets: fewer graduate programs, fewer positions, and limited opportunities. However, rather than a decimation of the field of Performance Studies, what has happened is better termed "consolidation and refinement." Doctoral and M.A. programs are geographically available in every part of the country, nearly every one offering graduate students financial help and teaching opportunities. When one program dies, another is born. Less than one in five programs report major problems placing graduates. The majority report few problems with staffing, research, colleague and administrative support. Viewing artistic achievement as scholarship is supported in the majority of institutions. A growing number of institutions have activated large enrollment courses that are seen by some as mixed blessings. Gone are the intimate classes of 15 to 20 students. In their place is a large enrollment class that feeds interested students into smaller upper level courses where learning is shared by like-minded students and professors. In addition to the large enrollment classes, two thirds of the institutions surveyed require Performance Studies for undergraduate majors, almost half require it for minors, and over one third have other departments that require Performance Studies. This confirms Performance Studies as a vital subject area. The recent name change to Performance Studies has encouraged a more diverse discipline that can and has fostered more interaction with other scholars whose disciplinary demarcations have become blurred. We note, in addition to the inter-disciplinary exchanges and the creation of Performance in Society curricula occurring on the institutional level, the emerging national interest in oral history, personal narratives, performance ethnography, post-structuralist semiotics, constructivism, performance as cultural behavior, phenomenology, and a changed and greatly broadened definition of what constitutes performance.[21]

This survey covers two decades, decades dominated by the twin 12 themes of accountability and retrenchment. As we enter the 1990s, a period of enormous potential for growth and expansion, we anticipate a renewed burst of educational activity and growth. Performance Studies, "leaner and meaner," can and will make a significant contribution to graduate education.

ENDNOTES

1 Judith C. Espinola and Kenneth Crannell, "Graduate Degree Programs in Oral Interpretation," *Speech Teacher*, 21.2 (1972): 123-126.

2 Malthon M. Anapol and H. Thomas Hurt, "Graduate Study in Speech 1966-1971," *Speech Teacher*, 22.1(1973): 18-26.

3 Jill Taft-Kaufman, "Oral Interpretation: Twentieth Century Theory and Practice," *Speech Communication in the 20th Century*, ed. Thomas W. Benson (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985) 157.

[4]Robert C. Jeffrey and William Work, "Historical Notes: The Speech Communication Association, 1965-1989," in*The Past is Prologue: A 75th Anniversary History of SCA*, William Work and Robert C. Jeffrey, Eds., Speech Communication Association: Annandale, Virginia: (1989) p.31.

[5]Letter from William Work, Executive Secretary of SCA, dated September 19, 1985.

[6]Source is writer's mailing list obtained from SCA in 1988.

[7]*Directory of Graduate Programs in the Communication Arts and Sciences 1986-1987* ed. Robert N. Hall Speech Communication Association: Annandale, Virginia (1985) 1-315.

[8]The 23 Institutions offering M.A. degrees only are as follows: University of Alabama, Arizona State University, Arkansas State University, California State University at Northridge, Northeastern Illinois University, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Western Illinois University, Ball State University, Indiana State University, Purdue University, Fort Hays State University, Emerson College, Mankato State University, New Mexico State University, Fordham University, Queens College of CUNY, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Dakota State University, Ohio University, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, Baylor University, North Texas State University, University of Northern Iowa. The four added institutions are Florida State University, University of Maine at Orono, Brooklyn College of CUNY, Bowling Green State University.

Institutions offering both the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees (10) include the following: Louisiana State University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Pennsylvania State University, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, University of Arizona, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Texas at Austin, University of Utah, and the University of Washington. As of 1990, Michigan State University has cancelled its program in Performance Studies. The University of California at Berkeley was not included in the survey because it was not listed in the *Directory* as offering the Ph.D. in Performance Studies. The University of Pennsylvania, while listed in the Directory as offering the Ph.D in Performance Studies, does not have an active program in Performance Studies.

In 1972, Espinola and Crannell mailed questionnaires to seventy-nine institutions listed in the SCA's Directory of Graduate Programs in Speech: 1969-70 as offering graduate degrees in Oral Interpretation. The 1986-87 Directory lists thirty three institutions which offer graduate

[9]Espinola and Crannell, 123.

[10]Anapol and Hurt, 20.

[11]Anapol and Hurt, 19-20.

[12]Some institutions offer graduate degrees in Oral Interpretation/Performance Studies but some do not have areas of concentration in their graduate programs.

[13] Anapol and Hurt, 22.

[14]Ph.D. granting institutions report single instances of 3, 4, and 5 minority candidates for a total of 12.

[15]M.A. only institutions report 3 single instances of 1 minority male for a total of 3.

[16]Ph.D granting institutions report single instances of 1, 2, 5, 5, 6 minority female candidates for a total of 19.

[17]M.A. only institutions report three single instances of 1, 3, 5, minority female candidates for a total of 9.

[18]Ph. D. granting institutions report male Ph.D. enrollment as single instances of 2, 4, 7, and 11 students for a total of 24.

[19]Ph.D. granting institutions report female Ph.D. enrollment as single instances of 1, 2, 6, and 8 students for a total of 17.

[20]M.A.-only institutions report minority female M.A. enrollment as two single instances of one student for a total of two students.

[21]Taft-Kaufman, 170.

WORKS CITED

Anapol, Malthon M. and H. Thomas Hurt. "Graduate Study in Speech 1966-1971." Speech Teacher 22.1 (1973) 18-26.

Espinola, Judith C. and Kenneth C. Crannell. "Graduate Degree Programs in Oral Interpretation." Speech Teacher 21.2 (1972): 123-126.

Speech Communication Association Mailing List. Interpretation Division. 1988.

Taft-Kaufman, Jill. "Oral Interpretation: Twentieth Century Theory and Practice." *Speech Communication in the Twentieth Century.* Ed. Thomas W. Benson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1985.

Jeffrey, Robert C. and William Work. *History of the Speech Communication Association.* Speech Communication Association: Annandale, Virginia 1989.

HOWARD D. DOLL
DEPT. OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION
UNC – CH CB #3285
CHAPEL HILL, N.C. 27599

TABLE 1

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN PERFORMANCE STUDIES

M.A.		Ph.D.	
Northeast	3	Northeast	1
Southeast	5	Southeast	1
Northcentral	8	Northcentral	4
Southcentral	1	Southcentral	1
Northwest	1	Northwest	1
Southwest	4	Southwest	2

HOWARD D. DOLL
DEPT. OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION
UNC – CH CB #3285
CHAPEL HILL, N.C. 27599

TABLE 2

INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENT PATTERNS

Nos. of Undergraduate Students		Nos. of Graduate Students	
Less than 5000	5%	Less than 1000	12%
5,000-10,000	18%	1,001-2,000	12%
10,001-20,000	41%	2,001-3,000	12%
20,001-30,000	18%	More than 3,000	16%
30,001-40,000	9%		

TABLE 3

AREAS OF CONCENTRATION

		MA (n = 12)	Ph.D. (n = 10)
1.	Code Systems	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2.	Intercultural Communication	5 (42%)	4 (40%)
3.	Interpersonal Communication	6 (50%)	8 (80%)
4.	Organizational Communication	7 (71%)	7 (70%)
5.	Oral Interpretation	10 (83%)[12]	5 (50%)
6.	Pragmatic Communication	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7.	Public Address	4 (33%)	5 (50%)
8.	Rhetorical and Communication Theory	7 (58%)	7 (70%)
9.	Speech Communication Education	6 (50%)	3 (30%)
10.	Speech and Hearing Sciences	2 (17%)	2 (20%)
11.	Theatre	4 (34%)	2 (20%)
12.	Radio-TV-Film	2 (17%)	1 (10%)
13.	Journalism/Mass Communications	2 (17%)	2 (20%)

TABLE 4

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS ALL INSTITUTIONS

Less than 100	4 (18%)	401-500	3 (14%)
101-200	3 (14%)	501-600	2 (9%)
201-300	3 (14%)	601+	4 (18%)
301-400	3 (14%)		

TABLE 5

DEPARTMENTAL GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Male Ph.D.		Male M.A.		Minority Male Ph.D.		Minority Male M.A.	
0	68%	0	27%	0	86%	0	75%
1-5	5%	1-5	18%	1-5	14%[14]	1-5	25%[15]
5-10	5%	5-10	18%				
11-15	14%	11-15	18%				
16+	9%	16+	18%				
Female Ph.D.		**Female MA**		**Minority Female Ph.D.**		**Minority Female M.A.**	
0	30%	0-10	17%	0	50%	0	75%
1-5	0%	11-20	50%	1-6	50%[16]	1-5	25%[17]
6-10	10%	21-30	8%				
11-15	40%	31-40	8%				
16-20	20%	41-50	0%				
		51-62	17%				

TABLE 6

PERFORMANCE STUDIES GRADUATE ENROLLMENT

Male Ph.D.		Male M.A.		Minority Male Ph.D.		Minority Male M.A.	
0	60%	0	58%	0	93%	0	83%
1-5	20%	1-2	25%	1	7%	1-2	17%
6-10	10%	3-4	17%	1+	0%	2+	0%
10+	10%[18]	4+	0%				

Female Ph.D.		Female M.A.		Minority Female Ph.D.		Minority Female M.A.	
0	60%	0	67%	0	90%	0	83%
1-5	30%	1-2	8%	1	10%	1-2	17%[20]
6-10	10%[19]	3-4	25%				

TABLE 7

GRADUATE STIPENDS

M.A. Range= $2,400-$7,500		Ph.D. Range $2,400-$13,000	
$2,400 to $2999	17%	$2400 to $4,999	10%
$3,000 to $3,999	8%	$5,000 to $5,999	20%
$4,000 to $4,999	17%	$6,000 to $7,999	10%
$5,000 to $5,999	25%	$8,000 to $8,999	20%
$6,000 to $6,999	8%	$9,000 to $9,999	20%
$7,000+	8%	$10,000+	0%
NR	17%	NR	10%

TABLE 8

GRADUATE FACULTY REPRESENTATION

M.A. (n = 204)		Ph.D. (n =172)	
00-09	17%	00-09	10%
10-15	33%	10-15	30%
16-20	25%	16-20	30%
21-25	17%	21-25	20%
26-30	5%	26-30	10%
31+	5%		
M.A. Male		**Ph.D. Male**	
Range = 4-21		**Range = 1-16**	
00-4	34%	0-4	40%
5-9	25%	5-9	40%
10-15	34%	10-15	10%
15+	7%	15+	10%
M.A. Female		**Ph.D. Female**	
Range = 3-12		**Range = 1-11**	
0-4	50%	0-4	60%
5-9	33%	5-9	30%
10-15	17%	10-15	10%

TABLE 9

PRESENT PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

Staffing	Research Support	Attracting Grad Students	Placing Grad Students
None 23%	None 09%	None 00%	None 23%
Slight 45%	Slight 59%	Slight 23%	Slight 32%
Sign 14%	Sign 18%	Sign 54%	Sign 00%
Major 09%	Major 05%	Major 05%	Major 18%
NA 09%	NA 09%	NA 18%	NA 27%
Space Problems	**Colleague Support**	**Administrative Support**	**Equipment & Supplies**
None 27%	None 32%	None 41%	None 23%
Slight 14%	Slight 27%	Slight 18%	Slight 50%
Sign 27%	Sign 18%	Sign 14%	Sign 09$
Major 18%	Major 05%	Major 05%	Major 00%
NA 14%	NA 18%	NA 22%	NA 18%

TABLE 10

MASTERS PROGRAMS IN RANK OF PERCEIVED QUALITY

1	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	1.28
2	Arizona State University	3.57
3	University of Maine at Orono	3.74
4	Emerson College	4.0
5	California State University at Northridge	4.0
6	Indiana State University	4.75
7	University of Northern Iowa	5.0
8	North Texas State University	6.33
9	Bowling Green State University	7.66
10	New Mexico State University	10.2

TABLE 11

DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN RANK OF PERCEIVED QUALITY

3.	Northwestern University	1.24
8.	University of Texas at Austin	2.82
5.	Southern Illinois at Carbondale	3.00
1.	Louisiana State University	3.07
7.	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	5.44
9.	University of Utah	5.62
6.	University of Arizona	5.66
10.	University of Washington	8.61
4.	Pennsylvania State University	9.01